

To: FOSTER Eugene P[FOSTER.Eugene@deq.state.or.us]; CAMACHO Ivan[CAMACHO.Ivan@deq.state.or.us]; GARZA Luciano[GARZA.Luciano@deq.state.or.us]; COUTU Adam[COUTU.Adam@deq.state.or.us]
Cc: Croxton, Dave[Croxton.David@epa.gov]; Curtis, Cynthia[Curtis.Cynthia@epa.gov]
From: Henning, Alan
Sent: Thur 3/3/2016 10:33:32 PM
Subject: RE: My notes from yesterday's meetings

Gene and Ivan,

Thanks for the summaries and the questions. I will share this with Cyd and will get answers to your questions. My thanks to all who participated in the discussion. It is a very good start to addressing the 50/50 issue.

Alan

From: FOSTER Eugene P [mailto:FOSTER.Eugene@deq.state.or.us]
Sent: Thursday, March 03, 2016 11:39 AM
To: CAMACHO Ivan <CAMACHO.Ivan@deq.state.or.us>; Henning, Alan <Henning.Alan@epa.gov>; GARZA Luciano <GARZA.Luciano@deq.state.or.us>; COUTU Adam <COUTU.Adam@deq.state.or.us>
Cc: FOSTER Eugene P <FOSTER.Eugene@deq.state.or.us>
Subject: RE: My notes from yesterday's meetings

Thanks Ivan

In addition, below is what I heard and where I think we are:

Waivers

- A waiver from the 50/50 requirement is to be used for special or unusual circumstances
- should be used infrequently

- [redacted] typically issued at time of grant
- [redacted] EPA HQ suggested Oregon use the waiver option for the 2015 and 2016 grants
- [redacted] this would give Oregon and EPA R10 time to develop the leveraged exemption approach

Leveraged Exemption

- [redacted] staff time used to implement a Watershed Based Plan (WBP) can be used for leveraged exemption from the 50/50 requirement
- [redacted] EPA HQ recommended DEQ pursue this leveraged exemption approach using WBP
- [redacted] EPA HQ did not recommend using alternatives to WBP
- [redacted] WBP can be very simple and can be a subset of more complex planning documents
- [redacted] the other planning documents used for the WBP can be incorporated by reference
- [redacted] there is a WBP checklist for what needs to be in the WBP, the checklist is developed from the EPA WBP Handbook
- [redacted] identification of critical areas and BMPs are important part of WBP
- [redacted] WBP typically developed at the HUC 12 or smaller
- [redacted] Important to show implementation and WQ status/trends
- [redacted] there was discussion of using the Rogue as a pilot for developing a WBP

Minnesota may be a good example for Oregon to review because of the similarity between how we do our PPG, etc...

Action Items:

- [redacted] Alan will send DEQ the WBP checklist

- Alan will talk with Bill Meyers about using the Rogue for WBP, Alan - I would like to be included in some of those discussions

- EPA HQ will send the Minnesota examples to DEQ

Alan - can the states get a leveraged exemption for staff time being used to implement the states NPS Management Program Plan?

Anything else to add?

thanks

Gene

From: CAMACHO Ivan
Sent: Thursday, March 03, 2016 10:15 AM
To: FOSTER Eugene P
Cc: 'Henning, Alan'; COUTU Adam; GARZA Luciano
Subject: My notes from yesterday's meetings

Thank you for participating.

EPA Contacts:

Alan Henning, Oregon 319 contact, grants 2015-16

Jill Fullagar, For overall questions with 319 program, open grants 2011-2014

Jayne Carlin, TMDL program

Mary Sturman, Alan will let us know

Regarding the 50/50 exemption option. Answers provided by Alan:

1. For which Fiscal Year do we need to demonstrate 50/50? 2015, 2016, or both?
 - a. Answer: starting 2015-16
2. If we decide to use "exemptions" do we need to enter data for projects that we use to demonstrate state funds are used to implement WBPs into GRTS?
 - a. Answer: YES
3. What are the criteria used to demonstrate adequacy of "alternatives to WBP"?
 - a. Measurable benefits
 - b. Strategy (s) addressing the EPA 9-key elements, as referenced in a checklist
 - i. Using Rogue watershed cross referenced strategies in checklist
 - c. Approach to be reviewed and approved by regional EPA contact
 - d. Information referenced in page 35 of 2013 Nonpoint Source Program and Grants Guidelines for States and Territories
4. Do you have an example letter for "waiver"?
 - a. I heard and took note of Cyd, of EPA HQ to provide the following:
 - i. Sample waiver documentation from Minnesota
 - ii. Other supporting/reference information
5. How often does an exemption request need to be submitted, and a waiver?
 - a. Answer: as an email, Every year
6. Exemption/Waiver letter components:
 - a. Exemption/Leveraging funds with NPS FTE's work in PPG as strictly directed to TMDL/watershed based strategies
 - i. DEQ will meet and present recommendations to EPA

documenting funding to address the 50/50 pass through leverage funding

ii. Developing a WBP is a priority, using the checklist cross referenced as a strategy. Once the WBP are approved NPS FTE information could be linked to document watershed based supporting NPS funding.

b. Waiver as a last resource. DEQ has not decided if that is the way to go. More information is needed.

Regarding 2015 NPS annual report.

The discussion was brief with Alan as we were leaving from yesterday's meeting:

- a. Report will be as recommended in the 2014 Determination of Progress for Oregon's NPS management Program
- b. Concise, Straight to the point, directly addressing the recommendations listed in letter above
- c. EPA would like to award the 2016 funds by June 1, 2016
- d. Ivan is the contact for drafting the NPS annual report
- e. A draft outline is being prepared for Gene.

Your comments/additions/edits are welcome

By Monday, March 7th, 2016 if you please.

Respectfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Ivan Camacho". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Ivan Camacho

Oregon 319 Grants Administrator

Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

811 SW 6th Ave.

Portland, OR 97204

(503) 229-5088